

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW

Exhibits and/or Demonstrations

None.

Identification of Claims Discussed

22-38.

Identification of Prior Art Discussed

U.S. Patent No. 4,827,639 (Wang) and U.S. Patent No. 1,313,778 (Atkinson et al.)

Proposed Amendments

Applicant proposed to amend Claims 35 and 38 to be clarify that the single clip is sized and shaped to hold together the two overlay sections.

Principal Arguments and Other Matters

Applicant argued that no reference teaches a double clip that serves the dual functions of holding two panels together in addition to holding the sections of each panel together. The one reference that the Examiner feels is "frameless" is Wang, and Wang's double clip does not serve to hold overlay sections together. Furthermore, Wang does not teach or suggest a single clip, but has only a double clip. No reference of record has both a single clip and a double clip where the clips all define notches sized and shaped to hold two overlay sections together.

Objections to the drawings and specifications were also discussed.

Results of Interview

The Examiner suggested that Applicant amend Claims 35 and 38 as discussed, and that the Examiner may be willing to enter the amendment as merely clarifying. In addition, the Examiner stated that written argument with regard to the dual function of double clip and lack of suggestions in the prior art to combine double clips with single clips with notches that all function to hold two overlay sections together, would be considered.

The Examiner also agreed to withdraw objections to the drawings and specification, as the specification does indeed disclose reference numeral 80 of Figure 3B.

REMARKS

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for indicating the allowability of Claims 36 and 37. In response, Applicants have rewritten Claims 36-37 in independent form.

Amendments

Applicants have amended Claims 35 and 38 to clarify that the single clip defines a notch "sized and shaped to hold together the front and back overlay sections." As discussed in the Examiner Interview, the amendment merely clarifies what was earlier implied in the claim, particularly since all of the claims recite "frameless" systems. The amendments were not earlier presented due to the previous indication that Claim 35 was allowable, and the rationale for allowability for Claim 35 appeared to extend to Claim 38. In view of the Examiner's withdrawal of allowability of Claim 35, Applicants have added clarifying amendments in conjunction with the arguments herein.

Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Objection to Drawings and Specification

The Examiner has objected to the drawings for failure to show the overlay sections including a recess sized to receive the clip, as recited in Claim 33. The Examiner also objected to the drawings for including a reference numeral 80 in Figure 3B that was is not mentioned in the description.

As discussed in the Examiner Interview, and as indicated in the prior Response, page 8 of the Specification, at paragraph 14 states:

The transparent section 3 and the backing section 4 may be equipped with a recess or locking mechanism 80 (see Fig. 3b) to help secure the clips 8 where contact is made with the clips 8. (Emphasis added).

As mentioned in the previous Response, this is clearly an embodiment of a recess and provides antecedent basis in the Specification for a recess. It should be noted, however, that the claim is not limited to the recess of the illustrated embodiment.

Rejections in View of Prior Art

The Examiner has rejected Claims 22-29, 33 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang (U.S. Patent No. 4,827,639) in view of Sterla (U.S. Patent No. 905,951) and Dammond (U.S. Patent No. 3,665,628). The Examiner has also rejected Claims 22, 24-27, 29-31, and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Atkinson (U.S. Patent No. 1,313,778) and Dammond.

Applicants respectfully submit that the references, individually or in combination, fail to suggest all of the features of the pending claims.

As discussed in the Examiner interview, Applicants have amended Claims 35 and 38 to clarify that the notch of the single clip is sized and shaped to hold together the front and back overlay sections. Independent Claim 22 already recited this limitation.

Accordingly, each of the claims recites a frameless system with a double clip and a single clip, wherein each notch of the double and single clip is sized and shaped to hold together the front and back overlay sections. Accordingly, the double clip of the structure recited is capable of serving two functions: the double clip holds together two different picture display panels; and the notches of the double clip also hold together the two overlay sections of each picture display panel. Furthermore, each of the pending claims recites a single clip in addition to the double clip, where the single clip also defines a notch sized and shaped to hold together the front and back overlay sections of one of the picture display panels. This feature further clarifies the frameless nature of the system being claimed.

The asserted prior art neither teaches nor suggests the combination of elements in each of the pending claims. The Examiner is taking the position that Wang could be interpreted to be "frameless." However, Wang lacks any teaching or suggestion that its double clip serves the function of holding together the overlay sections. In fact, Wang makes clear that slits 21 and 31 are provided for sliding photographs therein. If the double clip of Wang was configured to hold together the overlay sections of Wang, there would be no need to provide slits 21 and 31 to slide photographs between the two overlay sections. Separate means are evidently provided in Wang to hold to overlay sections together.

Nor does any other reference teach or suggest the recited combination of double clips and single clips. Sterla, for example, teaches double clips only, and has no teaching of single clips. Dammond teaches no double clip at all.

Appl. No. : 09/823,816
Filed : March 30, 2001

Atkinson may have a double clip of some sort, but it is not sized and shaped to hold together front and back overlay sections. This is because Atkinson is actually piecing together multiple frames, and thus Atkinson also fails to teach the feature of framelessness and the fact that the notches hold together the overlay sections "without a frame at the edge."

The Examiner points to single clip K in Atkinson and the member J. However, these elements are designed to work with an existing frame and to hang picture frames to the side wall of a window structure. Accordingly, the clips are not sized and shaped to hold together front and back overlay sections in a frameless system. On the contrary, they are sized and shaped to accommodate a conventional edge frame.

Accordingly, no single reference, and no combination of references, teaches both a double clip and a single clip wherein each of the notches are sized and shaped to hold together front and back overlay sections in a frameless system.

Appl. No. : 09/823,816
Filed : March 30, 2001


CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and requests the same. If, however, some issue remains that the Examiner feels can be addressed by Examiner Amendment, the Examiner is cordially invited to call the undersigned for authorization.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: November 9, 2004

By: 
Adeel S. Akhtar
Registration No. 41,394
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(415) 954-4114

W:\DOCS\ASA\ASA-15924.DOC
101804